



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,530	03/29/2001	Kazutoyo Maehiro	P23936	5426
7055	7590	03/31/2008	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				LEE, PHILIP C
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2152		
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
03/31/2008			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

1. The request for reconsideration has been entered and considered but it is not persuasive.
2. In the remarks, applicant argued that:
 - (1) Tatham merely discloses a password, and does not teach setup information, as described in the claimed invention.
 - (2) Luzeski does not appear to "set... an area on a database in a storage section of a chairman's video game terminal," as recited in the claims. Luzeski fails to teach setup information that is "not visible on the guests' video game terminals," as explicitly recited.
 - (3) Examiner fails to provide proper reasons why the claimed invention would be obvious and Examiner is relying upon impermissible hindsight.

3. In response to points (1) and (2), applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The combination of Morris with Slutsman, Tatham and Luzeski teaches the invention as claimed. Specifically, Morris teaches chairman's video game terminal and guests' video game terminals (col. 6, lines 56-62; col. 12, lines 32-33). Morris does not teach storing setup information in a storage section of a chairman's game terminal. Slutsman teaches setup information for setting said area in a storage section of chairman's terminal (col. 2, lines 49-56, 60-62; col. 3, lines 4-

10)(storing session ID of a conference in host terminal). This means the combination of Morris and Slutsman teaches the claimed feature of “storing setup information for setting said area in storage section of a chairman’s video game terminal”. Morris and Slutsman do not teach the setup information include a password. Tatham teaches setup information includes address of workgroup (col. 5, lines 9-12) for activities such as group discussion, project collaboration, and chat room (col. 6, lines 14-16) (i.e., setup of a conference), invitation to join the workgroup, and password for gaining access to the workgroup (col. 5, lines 12-14). This means the combination of Morris, Slutsman and Tatham teaches storing setup information for setting said area in storage section of a chairman’s video game terminal, wherein the setup information includes a password as claimed. Morris, Slutsman and Tatham do not teach the setup information is not visible on guests' video game terminals. Luzeski teaches setup information such as session ID and password are not aware by the users (col. 7, lines 40-43) (setup information is not visible on terminals). This means the combination of Morris, Slutsman, Tatham and Luzeski teaches the setup information is not visible on the guest video game terminals as claimed.

4. In response to point (3), Examiner already provided the proper motivations for supporting obviousness to combine Morris with Slutsman, Tatham and Luzeski as stated in paragraphs 8, 10 and 12 of the previous office mailed on 12/20/2007. In addition, applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include

knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

P.L.